DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 468 JC 870 106

TITLE	Interdistrict Enrollment. California Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Feb 87
NOTE	41p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Choice; *Community Colleges; *Educational Legislation; Enrollment; Enrollment Influences; *Enrollment Trends; *Interdistrict Policies; *Residence Requirements; State Legislation; State Surveys; Trend Analysis; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

California community colleges inherit their statutes on interdistrict enrollment from those in force for California elementary and secondary schools. Prior to 1978, statutory restrictions on students enrolling in a college outside the district in which they lived were tied to the method of funding. A 1978 change in funding methodology, followed by the modification of statutes in 1981 and 1982, eased restrictions on interdistrict enrollment. In 1986, interdistrict enrollment was at its highest level in at least 10 years. With the exception of Los Angeles County, unrestricted interdistrict enrollment is the current pattern throughout California. More than one in every ten students (one in five in certain urban areas) attend a college outside their district of residence. Activity is concentrated in a few districts, with one-tenth of all districts accounting for half of the more than 134,000 interdistrict enrollments estimated for 1985. Students who cross district boundaries share the same characteristics with students who enroll in their district of residence. They enroll in colleges outside their district for several reasons, including proximity, specific programs, better programs or a better general curriculum, more attractive facilities, and the characteristics of other students. While interdistrict enrollment does not appear to contribute to program and course duplication, it may constrain the development of certain small colleges, and a large sudden net outflow of students can have a dramatic effect on a large district's fiscal condition. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278468

INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

JC 870 106

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT

California
Community
Colleges

Research and Analysis Unit
Chancellor's Office

Sacramento
February 1987

INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
Summary	1
Background	2
Statutes	2
Board of Governors' Policy Proposals	4
Current Status	5
Numbers of Interdistrict Migrants	5
Characteristics of Interdistrict Migrants	8
Issues	10
Why do students migrate between districts?	10
Does interdistrict attendance result in program and course duplication?	12
How does interdistrict migration affect the ethnic composition of enrollment?	12
How does student migration affect districts' fiscal condition and ability to plan?	14
Which districts are adversely impacted (by interdistrict enrollment) at present?	15
References	16

Appendix A: Interdistrict Enrollment Survey, 1986

Appendix B: Interdistrict Student Enrollment, All Districts, Fall 1985

Appendix C: Statewide Comparison of Interdistrict Students and Other Students, Fall 1985

Appendix D: Regional Comparison of Interdistrict Students and Other Students, Fall 1985

Appendix E: Number and Characteristics of Interdistrict Enrollment, Selected Districts, Fall 1985

Preface

Like many other areas of policy, California Community Colleges inherit their statutes on interdistrict enrollment from those in force for California elementary and secondary schools. Prior to 1978, statutory restrictions on students enrolling in a college outside the district in which they lived were tied to the method of funding. Even then, however, the logic of this arrangement was not altogether clear. Virtually all community college students were adults, most were highly mobile -- willing to commute -- and some were denied access to the postsecondary education they preferred because of arbitrary limits on their ability to move across district boundaries.

Today, the picture has changed. The 1978 change in funding methodology, following enactment of Proposition 13, and modification of statutes to ease restrictions on interdistrict enrollment in 1981 and 1982, have resulted in more than one in every ten (one in five in certain urban areas) community college students crossing district boundaries to attend college.

While the evidence suggests few major problems, the topic of interdistrict enrollment continues to draw attention. One the one hand, preventing individuals from attending the college that is nearest their residence may deny them access to education because transportation is a major component of the college-going cost facing the typical community college student. Nor is it in the best interests of either taxpayers or students to prevent the latter from enrolling in the educational programs that are best suited to their interests and ability. On the other hand, taxpayers and students also have an interest in colleges being able to effectively plan for enrollment changes and subsequent funding and programmatic changes.

This study was undertaken partly as the result of a request of the Master Plan Review Commission for their work on a response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 54 (1984). A preliminary draft of our report was provided to the Commission in December 1986 to assist them in their deliberations. Findings of this report should assist possible future efforts at clarifying and improving policies on the interdistrict enrollment of community college students.

Work on this study was conducted by the Chancellor's Office Research and Analysis Unit under the direction of Chuck McIntyre. We invite your comments and questions.

Joshua L. Smith
Chancellor

Sacramento
February 1987

SUMMARY

This report reviews the status of interdistrict enrollment in California Community Colleges: the law, policy proposals, and level of current activity.

Interdistrict enrollment is at its highest level in at least ten years, having increased substantially following the shift to state funding in 1979 and the liberalization of interdistrict enrollment restrictions in 1981 and 1982. Districts may still enter into interdistrict agreements on student flow and issue notices restricting their residents from attending colleges in other districts, however.

Aside from the situation in Los Angeles County, unrestricted interdistrict enrollment or "free flow" is the current pattern throughout California. More than one in every ten (one in five in certain urban areas) community college students attend a college outside their district of residence. Activity is concentrated among a few districts. One-tenth of all districts accounted for half of the more than 134,000 interdistrict enrollments estimated for 1985.

Students who cross district boundaries are much like those who do not. The few differences that do exist suggest that in contrast to students who attend college in their district of residence, students who cross district boundaries generally are more often young, male, Black, and enrolled for credit. This statewide profile appears to contrast with the Los Angeles pattern where students migrating out of the Los Angeles District are more often White and Asian and pursuing transfer objectives on a full-time basis.

Students enroll at colleges outside their district of residence for several reasons: proximity, specific programs, better programs or a better general curriculum, more attractive facilities or reputation, and the characteristics of other students.

While interdistrict enrollment does not appear to contribute to program and course duplication, it may constrain the development of certain small colleges. And, a large sudden net outflow of students can have a dramatic impact on a district's fiscal condition. The Los Angeles District appears to have been adversely impacted recently by such a shift, although this migration of student appears to have subsided. Outside Los Angeles, interdistrict enrollment patterns do not appear to be adversely impacting any other districts at present. However, the viability of certain districts, whose enrollments are made up of large numbers of students from other districts, depends to a degree on continuation of current interdistrict enrollment patterns.

BACKGROUND

The California Master Plan Review Commission was requested by the Legislature in Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 54, 1984, to do a study of community college enrollment losses from the perspective of inner-city districts where interdistrict attendance may account for part of the problem. The Commission, in turn, asked the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to mediate the interdistrict attendance situation between Los Angeles and adjacent districts and prepare a plan for its solution. This request couldn't be honored under current law since the Board does not have authority to conduct such mediation. Chancellor's Office staff, however, have prepared information for the use of Commission. This report on interdistrict enrollment is based on that work.

Statutes

Policy on the interdistrict attendance or enrollment of community college students has evolved from the combined elementary and secondary/junior college statutes in force up to the end of the 1960s. These statutes had both student access and fiscal features.

On the student access side, districts were required to enroll their own residents, but were not required to enroll those students who resided in other districts. Governing the interdistrict movement of students was a complex set of statutes that provided for interdistrict agreements between districts, notices of restriction requiring students to attend colleges in their district of residence, and permits for individual students to enroll in colleges outside their district of residence. Interdistrict attendance was "guaranteed" only if students were unable to obtain desired programs in their resident district.

The impact on access of such provisions was uncertain. In the late 1970s, about 6% of all student average daily attendance (ADA) was generated by students moving between districts. At that time, it was estimated that four of five requests by individuals interdistrict attendance permits were granted (Board of Governors, 1979). There were just under 4,000 permit denials each year and in only a few counties were such denials appealed. About 80% of such denials were reversed on appeal.

On the fiscal side, property taxes supported most of the cost of community college education in the 1970s and it was thought that local property-taxpayers ought to be responsible for residents of their own district, but not for residents of other districts. Accordingly, the state apportioned funds for ADA, based on the district of residence--then transferred the state aid to the district of attendance in those cases where students crossed district boundaries. The local share of the costs for these students was raised by a locally-set property tax and paid by the sending district to the

receiving district according to an agreement worked out between the two districts. These negotiations were often difficult due to differences in per-student costs and state aid between the sending and receiving districts.

The passage of Proposition 13 (1978) shifted the bulk of community college support from local property taxes to State General Fund apportionments and the fiscal problems inherent in interdistrict attendance became less important. Passage of subsequent legislation, AB 8 (1979), provided, among other things, that state apportionments be calculated and paid to districts based on student attendance, rather than residence. And, negotiated transfers of local funds for students moving between districts were no longer required.

Statutes on the flow of students between districts were amended in 1981 and 1982. These amendments revised the general policy so that students can now move between districts provided that there is available space and the move does not violate either an interdistrict agreement or a notice of restriction. The notice of restriction can be issued unilaterally, but at least four months prior to the term for which the notice is to be effective.

Students who are prevented from attending a college due to a notice of restriction or interdistrict attendance agreement may appeal to the county board of education. The board acts within 30 days and if the appeal is granted and the student enrolls, the sending district must pay the receiving district a sum either determined by agreement or, in the absence of an agreement, a sum equal to that charged nonresidents (of California) less $125.

Another law change in 1981 created a special Education Code section where up to 5,000 credit ADA of Los Angeles district residents could not be restricted from attending Santa Monica. The more general statutes then applied to any migrating ADA beyond that limit. This special section expired on July 1, 1986, and the Los Angeles and Santa Monica districts entered into a three-year agreement where up to 5,000 ADA may still migrate from Los Angeles to Santa Monica without restriction, but Santa Monica will pay Los Angeles for those beyond the 5,000 limit who attend Santa Monica. The reimbursement is to be paid in fixed sums for multiples of ADA beyond the limit. In this case, the receiving district is paying the sending district.

In recent years, Los Angeles also has had interdistrict attendance agreements with nine other adjacent districts. After two years of severe enrollment losses, Los Angeles notified these districts in the fall 1984 that it planned to terminate its agreements and would issue notices of restriction in order to curtail student migration that Los Angeles felt was contributing to its enrollment loss. The adjacent districts reacted adversely, and Los Angeles subsequently negotiated agreements with seven of its neighbors.

This controversy led to the introduction early in 1985 of legislation, AB 267 and SB 225, to permit unlimited interdistrict enrollment or "free flow" unless the receiving

district did not have sufficient space. The bills also prohibited the charging of fees for the enrollment of students from outside the district. Neither bill was successful.

Board of Governors' Policy Proposals

As part of its Long-Term Finance Plan in 1979, the Board of Governors had recommended a modified free flow policy on interdistrict attendance, suggesting provisions that would:

- Liberalize current policies, beginning 1981-82, for a three year period:
  - permit students to attend the college and district of their choice, subject to available facilities and affording admissions priority to district residents,
  - adjust district base budgets or mandate transfer of local funding involved in enrollment shifts,
  - allow districts to restrict outward flow of residents on either a district or college basis after their number exceeds 10% of prior year enrollment.

This policy was not included in the legislation, AB 8 (1979) and subsequent bills, that enacted parts of the Board's Long Term Finance Plan.

After reviewing the matter of interdistrict attendance in light of the Los Angeles controversy, the Board of Governors adopted a revised policy in January 1985, proposing a law change in which it (the Board) would review proposed notices of restriction according to criteria spelled out in regulations. Other sections of current law would remain unchanged.

This proposed policy basically favored free flow but provided a safeguard for those districts adversely affected by an excessive outflow of students. The safeguard would be implemented through a process where a "sending" district could still negotiate mutually desirable restrictions on interdistrict attendance with each of its "receiving" districts. Failing that, the sending district could unilaterally propose a notice of restriction. The proposed law change, however, would require this proposed notice to first be filed with the Board of Governors as well as the affected district. The sending district would then be given further opportunity to negotiate an interdistrict agreement. Failing that, the sending district would present the Board with evidence describing the impact it would face if the outflow of its residents were not restricted. One the basis of this evidence, the Board would decide whether or not the notice should be filed.

After seeking unsuccessfully to amend this policy into SB 225, the Board voted in April 1986 to support the bill without change. By that time, the bill had been amended slightly to eliminate interdistrict attendance restrictions for all districts

with greater than 4,000 ADA. Twenty-five districts, including Los Angeles and most other urban districts, would have fallen under the free flow category. As noted above, however, this legislation did not pass during the 1985-86 session.

CURRENT STATUS

Traditionally, interdistrict attendance problems have been confined to the heavily populated urban areas, particularly the Los Angeles Basin, Orange and San Diego counties, and South Bay area plus a few suburban and rural districts where students live near a college in another district. The prominent case of interdistrict student migration is between the Los Angeles District and its ten neighboring districts.

Aside from the Los Angeles Basin situation, free flow is the typical current pattern throughout California. There are a number of notices of restriction still operative, however. A sample review of catalogs, performed in conjunction with a November 1986 telephone survey of those districts reporting the largest interdistrict enrollments, revealed that three of 21 such districts have issued such notices and another 11 districts warn of there being notices issued by other districts. (See Appendix A for survey results.)

Numbers of Interdistrict Migrants

During the fall 1985, nearly 134,000 or 12% of community college students are reported to have attended a college outside their district of residence. The actual number doubtless is greater than this since some students, crossing district boundaries, give false addresses and a few districts do not report data on interdistrict enrollment. While the data are incomplete, it appears that interdistrict enrollment was relatively stable during the late 1970s at about 6%. (See Table 1.) Beginning in 1979, however, interdistrict enrollment began to increase and today it is higher than at any time during the past ten years.

Most of the earlier increases in interdistrict enrollment during this decade appear to be the result of changes in funding policies at the turn of the decade and the relaxation of restrictions on student migration in 1981 and 1982. Most of the recent increase in activity is due to the increased outflow of students from the Los Angeles District. The Los Angeles District reported a net outflow of nearly 26,000 students in the spring 1985, an increase of one-third over the net outflow in the spring 1984 (Los Angeles Community College District, 1986). This increase in net outflow appears to have been due to (a) the impact of the new mandatory enrollment fee, which resulted in a greater cost increase for Los Angeles students than for students attending colleges in most of the neighboring districts, (b) the Los Angeles District moving to an academic calendar for 1984-85 that started earlier than most of its neighbors, (c) publicity surrounding the renegotiation, during 1984-85, of interdistrict agreements on student flow, and (d) other factors to be discussed below.

Table I
INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT AND ADA
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
1976 TO 1986

YEAR	TOTAL ADA	INTER-DISTRICT ADA	PERCENT	ENROLLMENT[a]	INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT	PERCENT
1976-77	736,702	42,264	5.7		NA	
1977-78	734,915	43,275	5.9		NA	
1978-79	658,716	39,651	6.0		NA	
1979-80	670,206	44,185	6.6		NA	
1980-81	725,741	55,075	7.6	1,135,541	69,721	6.1
1981-82		NA			NA	
1982-83		NA			NA	
1983-84		NA		1,218,008	120,131	9.7
1984-85	366,425[b]	51,314[b]	14.0	1,070,066	118,853	11.1
1985-86	475,733[c]	75,489[c]	15.9	1,143,894	133,686	11.7

[a] Total enrollment for whom residency status was known.
[b] Reporting from 35 of 70 districts.
[c] Reporting from 49 of 70 districts.

Sources: Chancellor's Office Management Information System and files of Fiscal Services Division, November 1986.

A few districts account for most of the interdistrict enrollment. Eight districts enroll half of the students that attend a community college outside their district (see Table 2). Santa Monica and Coast alone account for one-fifth of the total statewide activity for the "receiving" districts.

From the perspective of the "sending" districts, Los Angeles accounts for one-fourth of all activity; it and five other districts account for half of all enrollments that are "sent" (see Table 3).

Ten percent of all interdistrict enrollment is made up of the over 13,000 Los Angeles residents who attend Santa Monica College. This and the five other specific transfers displayed in Table 4 account for 27% of all activity.

The measure of net in- or out-flow of students in relation to a district's enrollment provides another perspective on interdistrict enrollment. (See Appendix B, Table 1.) Relatively large "senders" include San Jose, Los Angeles, MiraCosta, Saddleback, Mt. San Jacinto, and Chaffey. Relatively large "recipients" include Santa Monica, West Valley, Cerritos, Coast, Glendale and El Camino. By contrast, San Diego,

Table 2

ATTENDANCE OF INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT, FALL 1985

DISTRICT	COUNT	PERCENT OF STATE	CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE
Santa Monica	13,767	10.3	10.3
Coast	13,674	10.2	20.5
West Valley	9,570	7.2	27.7
Rancho Santiago	7,244	5.4	33.1
El Camino	7,122	5.3	38.4
Los Angeles	6,202	4.6	43.1
San Diego	5,955	4.5	47.5
Pasadena	5,628	4.2	51.7
State Total	133,686	100.0	100.0

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System, 1986

Table 3

RESIDENCE OF INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT, FALL 1985

DISTRICT	COUNT	PERCENT OF STATE	CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE
Los Angeles	33,538	25.1	25.1
San Jose	7,812	5.8	30.9
North Orange	7,147	5.3	36.3
Saddleback	6,659	5.0	41.3
San Diego	6,110	4.6	45.8
Rancho Santiago	5,417	4.1	49.9
State Total	133,686	100.0	100.0

Source: See Table 2

Palomar, Mt. San Antonio, and Southwestern report a large volume of exports and imports which effectively offset one another.

From still another perspective, 24 districts receive more than 10% of their enrollment from other districts. (See Appendix B, Table 2.) Once again, Santa Monica heads the list. Three of every five Santa Monica students are from another district (virtually all from Los Angeles). Two of every five West Valley students are from another district (mostly San Jose).

Table 4
SPECIFIC INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT, FALL 1985

DISTRICT OF ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT OF RESIDENCE	COUNT	PERCENT OF STATE
Santa Monica	Los Angeles	13,226	9.8
West Valley	San Jose	6,891	5.1
El Camino	Los Angeles	6,606	4.9
Coast	Rancho Santiago	4,810	3.5
Grossmont	San Diego	4,215	3.1
Pasadena	Los Angeles	4,197	3.1

Source. See Table 2

Characteristics of Interdistrict Migrants

Students who cross district boundaries to attend college are very much like those who do not. The few differences that do exist suggest that in contrast to students who attend college in the district of their residence, students who cross district boundaries to attend college generally are more often:

- young
- male
- Black
- transfers from another postsecondary institution
- enrolled in credit, rather than in noncredit, courses

Ninety-eight percent of the interdistrict students were enrolled in credit classes, while 84% of the students remaining in their district of residence were enrolled in credit classes during fall 1985. (See Appendix C, Table 1.) However, the credit loading of the two student types is virtually identical.

The distribution of interdistrict students by gender shows 49% male and 52% female, in contrast to 43% male and 57% female for all other "resident" students (see Table 2 in Appendix C). The only major difference in the ethnic distribution of the two groups is the slightly larger percentage of Black interdistrict students. Blacks constitute 9.4% of interdistrict students and 7.5% of resident students. Other ethnic categories do not vary substantially, if at all, between the two groups of students.

Another major difference is in the ages of the two groups (Appendix C, Table 3). Interdistrict students tend to be younger; fewer interdistrict students are older adults, 50 years of age and over (5.9% compared to 11.6% among resident students), a

finding that is consistent with the lower percentage of noncredit enrollment for interdistrict students.

The levels of academic work completed by both interdistrict and resident are very similar (Appendix C, Table 4). Finally, it appears that the interdistrict students are more often transfers from another institution, sometimes having attended the same college earlier (Appendix C, Table 5).

These statewide differences do not always hold true in the case of specific regions. For instance, relatively few students cross district boundaries to enroll in noncredit programs. However, in the Riverside/San Bernardino region, the relatively large enrollment of interdistrict students in noncredit classes at Chaffey and Coachella Valley makes this region an exception. Also, in the Riverside/San Bernardino and San Diego regions, relatively more interdistrict students are full-time than is the case in other regions. (See Appendix D, Table 1.)

Except for Los Angeles and the South Bay Area regions, a consistently larger percentage of male students crosses district boundaries than enrolls in the district of residence (Appendix D, Table 2).

Ethnic differences between interdistrict students and other students vary among the regions as well (Appendix D, Table 2). In the East Bay Area and San Diego regions, relatively fewer Asian students migrate between districts than is the case elsewhere. Blacks make up a larger percentage of interdistrict than of resident students in all regions except San Diego. The distribution of White students is relatively equal between the two groups throughout the State, except for Orange and San Diego, where relatively more of the interdistrict students are White. Hispanics generally tend not to migrate between districts, particularly in Orange and San Diego.

Younger students migrate between districts at a higher percentage than older students. The 18-24 year age cohort comprises a low of 43% of the interdistrict students in the Riverside/San Bernardino area up to a high of 53% in the Los Angeles region (Appendix D, Table 3); the statewide average of this cohort among migrants is 49%. The statewide average of this (18 to 24 year-old) cohort among residents is lower at 40%. Orange County reports the largest relative number of older students crossing district boundaries.

Differences in academic achievement between the two groups of students tend to be consistent among the six regions (Appendix D, Table 4) as are differences in status (Appendix D, Table 5).

ISSUES

Why do students migrate between districts?

Several factors motivate students to enroll at a college outside their district of residence: (a) proximity, (b) specific programs, (c) better programs or a better general curriculum, (d) more attractive facilities or reputation, and (e) the characteristics of other students. There are other factors, but these are the most frequently mentioned in the limited number of studies on the topic. The relative importance of these factors as revealed in these studies differs slightly. To some extent, this is due to differing study methods.

The 1986 telephone survey by Chancellor's Office staff revealed that college proximity, program diversity, college reputation or image and program quality were thought by district staff to be the most important factors in students' decisions to cross district boundaries. (See Appendix A.)

A study by MiraCosta (1984) concluded that it was sending younger, full-time students to Palomar for, in one-third of the cases, specific programs that MiraCosta doesn't offer. Residence location also was mentioned as a factor, but it isn't clear whether it was thought to be more or less important than the desire to enroll in specific programs.

In a 1985 study by the Institutional Research Consortium (IRC), course availability, program quality and college reputation were said to be more important than location by students attending Glendale, Pasadena and Santa Monica from other districts (largely Los Angeles). Parents' residence, friends' enrollment, and the ethnic mix of students were said to be least important. One of every five responding students (n = 1,868) indicated they would not attend any college if they were prevented from attending (by interdistrict enrollment restrictions, for instance) their current college.

Studies by the Los Angeles District (1984, 1986) on the characteristics of incoming and outgoing students indicates there has been a net outflow of younger, White and Asian students seeking transfer programs which they attend full-time. Recently, there has been an increase in those seeking job skill programs outside the district, as well. This Los Angeles basin pattern of interdistrict enrollment may differ from that reported elsewhere in the state..

Transportation is the most significant college-going cost facing community college students (Chancellor's Office, 1986). Consequently, those students for whom the shortest commuting time and distance is to a college in another district will want to attend that college if the program they seek is available. District boundaries seldom coincide with transportation patterns. An extreme example of this is where Los Angeles District residents live adjacent to El Camino College, but a considerable distance away from the nearest Los Angeles District college, Southwest. The desire

to shorten commuting costs also is said to be the primary reason why many San Jose District residents enroll at Mission and West Valley Colleges in the West Valley District.

The desire for specific programs, particularly in occupational education, which may not be available in a student's district of residence, is yet another reason for commuting across district boundaries. Multi-college districts may specialize certain high-cost programs at just a few of their colleges. Students who live near a college without that program, but closer to a college with that program in another district, will often attend the latter college. One-third of MiraCosta students enrolling at Palomar were found to be seeking specific occupational programs that were not offered at MiraCosta; programs such as nursing, electronic technology, engineering, telecommunications, health professions, consumer science, and aeronautics.

The desire for a more varied curriculum, often only available at a larger college, may attract students from another district. This appears to be part of the attraction for Los Angeles District residents who attend Santa Monica College (enrollment: 23,064), rather than West Los Angeles College (enrollment: 6,436). This motivation is also part of the reason Los Angeles residents attend El Camino College (enrollment: 24,865), rather than Los Angeles Southwest College (enrollment: 3,064). The very reason for this motivation results in its becoming a more important factor over time, as more students transfer and the disparity in size and, possibly, programs at two adjacent colleges grows.

Program quality also is a relatively important consideration for students crossing district boundaries to attend community colleges. As noted, quality descriptors constituted three of the top four reasons why students said they attended Glendale, Pasadena, and Santa Monica from other districts in the IRC survey. College staff appear to place somewhat less emphasis on program quality as a motivating factor, however, and more emphasis on location, program diversity, and general reputation. (See Appendix A.)

Reputation, environment and facilities also can be motivating factors for inter district attendance. Many students are reported to attend Orange Coast Community College because of its proximity to the ocean environment. Some of the students who attend Palomar College from the MiraCosta District reportedly do so because of the elaborate student center at the former institution.

How important the characteristics of other students are to an individual's choice to cross district boundaries isn't clear. On the one hand, the observed net outflow of White and Asian students from the Los Angeles inner city to the more suburban (and more heavily White and Asian) districts would support this notion. On the other hand, this factor was rated as relatively unimportant by these same students in their responses to the IRC survey. Moreover, this factor was not important in the MiraCosta-Palomar exchange and is not entirely clear in the case of Peralta and adjoining districts.

Does Interdistrict Attendance Result in Program and Course Duplication?

There is little evidence on possible duplication of programs because of interdistrict enrollment. It seems doubtful, however, that interdistrict enrollment contributes substantially to program and course duplication. More likely, interdistrict enrollment inhibits the ability of certain small colleges to offer a comprehensive set of programs and courses, possibly to the detriment of those students who remain.

While there is some program specialization among colleges, responses to the Chancellor's Office survey (1986) suggest that most districts try to offer comprehensive programs and services at each college regardless of offerings at other districts. To a large extent, enrollments at colleges by district residents justify and warrant the maintenance of comprehensive programs. Such programs include an appropriate lower division curriculum for preparing students for transfer and occupational programs directed toward skills employed by business and industry in the college's service area or region. In addition, there are the necessary programs of precollegiate basic skills instruction and student support services and, in some districts, adult education and/or community services.

In the case of some high cost occupational programs, many adjacent colleges will attempt to specialize. In fact, some interdistrict enrollment is the result of such specialization. The flow of students from MiraCosta to Palomar to obtain specific programs not available at MiraCosta is an example of this. One way to reverse this enrollment flow would be to duplicate these programs at MiraCosta. Student access would be improved. It isn't clear, however, that the added public costs for the instructional programs would be offset by the reduced private cost of transportation and time.

Student migration, in some instances, has prevented or inhibited the duplication of programs and courses. In the Los Angeles Southwest/El Camino area, students have chosen, some because of proximity, to attend the larger El Camino College, thus limiting the ability of the small Los Angeles Southwest College to establish a full set of programs and courses. From a regional standpoint, this may reduce the public costs for programs. However, it increases the private costs for those who must travel longer distances and reduces the availability of programs for remaining students who cannot afford the longer commuting costs.

How Does Interdistrict Migration Affect Ethnic Composition of Enrollment?

The effects of interdistrict migration on the ethnic composition of district enrollments differ in different parts of the state. In the Los Angeles Basin, interdistrict enrollment appears to make the Los Angeles District enrollment more heavily minority and, therefore, less ethnically balanced. By contrast, the exchange

between Peralta and its neighbors, South County and Contra Costa, increases the ethnic imbalance of Contra Costa, reduces that of South County, and appears to leave Peralta about the same. Elsewhere in the state, the impact does not appear to be significant.

In Los Angeles, the analysis of spring 1984 enrollment showed that Whites and Asians and Hispanics, to a slight degree, were leaving the district and Black students were entering (see Table 5).

Table 5
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY, LOS ANGELES

	ASIANS	BLACKS	HISPANICS	WHITES
Total Enrollment	13%	23%	23%	38%
Outflow	12	16	16	53
Inflow	8	30	14	44

Source: Los Angeles Community College District, *A Preliminary Review of Student Migration Patterns in the Los Angeles Area*, Los Angeles, September, 1984.

The flow of students from the Los Angeles District is substantially more complex, however, since the backgrounds of students leaving Los Angeles for specific districts appear to vary. (See Table 1 in Appendix E.) Disproportionate numbers of the following students from Los Angeles attend the following districts:

White	attend	Glendale
Asian		Pasadena
Black		El Camino
Hispanic		Rio Hondo
Hispanic and White		Cerritos
White		Santa Monica

Except for Rio Hondo, the distribution of interdistrict enrollment generally results in the districts adjacent to Los Angeles becoming more ethnically balanced.

While the data aren't complete, Peralta appears to have a slight net inflow of students from other districts. A 1985 report by the district on fall 1984 enrollment shows that Peralta imports students from Contra Costa and exports students to South County for a slight net inflow of students. A review of the characteristics of some of these students (in Appendix E, Table 2) shows that while a disproportionate number of the minorities residing in Contra Costa migrate to Peralta colleges, the total student flow tends to reduce Peralta's proportion of minority enrollment toward the statewide average. At the same time, a disproportionate number of White residents of Peralta attend South County, but the result of this net outflow is an

increase in South County's minority enrollment (toward the statewide average) and an increase in the proportion that minorities are of Peralta's enrollment.

Elsewhere, there appears to be little difference in the ethnic characteristics of students moving between districts. The ethnic balance of Coast, predominantly White, is improved slightly by an inflow of Hispanic students from Rancho Santiago (see Table 3 in Appendix E). Disproportionate numbers of White students from San Diego attend Grossmont, but the net result for the ethnic balance of both districts is slight.

How Does Student Migration Affect Districts' Fiscal Condition and Ability to Plan?

Six of the 21 districts in the Chancellor's Office survey indicated that student migration has had an effect on their fiscal stability and fiscal planning capability. In each case, the possible loss of ADA and revenue is the problem. Planning is affected by sudden unilateral actions on the part of other districts; actions such as the issuing of notices of restriction and establishment of new centers.

Part of the recent enrollment loss in the Los Angeles District was due to district residents attending colleges in other districts. A review of enrollment losses for the 21 survey districts in Appendix A shows that, between fall 1982 and fall 1985:

- Los Angeles enrollment declined by 31%
- Six districts to whom Los Angeles sends many students (Santa Monica, Cerritos, Compton, El Camino, Glendale, and Rio Hondo) declined by an average of 12%
- The remaining 63 community college districts in the state declined by 16%.

The loss in ADA in Los Angeles was followed by a loss in revenue and contributed, along with several other factors, to a serious cash flow problem by the spring 1985. Los Angeles enrollment losses lessened in fall 1985 and the outflow of students, according to district reports, stabilized. Fall 1986 enrollments in the district appear to have increased. However, the funding limit on state apportionments which is geared to increases in adult population (1.25% for Los Angeles in 1986), constrains the district from recovering revenues commensurate with its potential enrollment recovery.

Other districts in the Chancellor's Office survey who indicated that student migration has made fiscal planning difficult include Saddleback, Sierra, Glendale, Santa Monica, and Peralta. While Peralta has encountered fiscal problems, however, they do not appear to have been caused by a large outflow of students or by sudden changes in the East Bay Area patterns of interdistrict enrollment. As noted,

Peralta reported a net inflow of students for fall 1984. Other districts encountering fiscal problems in recent years, such as Chaffey, Lassen, and Compton, have attributed these problems to factors other than interdistrict enrollment.

A large, sudden net outflow of students can have a dramatic impact on a district's fiscal condition. The resulting loss of revenue, if not accompanied by expenditure reductions, can result in decreased budget reserves and, eventually, cash flow problems. This is particularly true in those districts that employ relatively few part-time faculty and may have difficulty making reductions in full-time certificated employees. It also can be true for relatively small districts where instructional support and overhead costs are relatively high and difficult to reduce.

Districts most vulnerable to this phenomenon (a sudden outflow of students) are those with substantial portions of their enrollment from outside the district. The viability of these districts depends to a degree on a continuation of current interdistrict enrollment patterns. Included among such districts are Santa Monica, West Valley, Citrus, Grossmont, Glendale, El Camino, Cerritos, and Sierra. Other districts for which a large increase in the outflow of students could prove troublesome include MiraCosta, San Jose, Mt. San Jacinto, and Chaffey.

Problems also could arise from a large, perhaps unanticipated, inflow of students, especially if this increase puts a district over its ADA funding cap; i.e., the number of ADA for which the district can be funded, i.e., receive state apportionment. In this case, district revenue increases will lag behind district expenditure increases, thereby causing a district to draw upon its reserves. A large inflow of students also may cause an unanticipated drain on student financial aid funds.

Which Districts are Adversely Impacted at Present?

Evidence in this and other reports suggests that interdistrict enrollment patterns in the Los Angeles Basin have had an adverse impact on the Los Angeles Community College District. These patterns appear to have constrained the development of West Los Angeles and Los Angeles Southwest Colleges and have resulted in the inner city colleges of the Los Angeles District becoming even more heavily enrolled with minority students. While the Los Angeles situation has stabilized and may even be improving, the ability of this district to recover is constrained by the fiscal growth cap.

Aside from Los Angeles, interdistrict enrollment patterns do not appear to be adversely impacting any other districts at present. However, the viability of a number of districts whose college enrollments are made up of many students from other districts depends to a degree on a continuation of current patterns.

REFERENCES

Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. ***Long-Term Finance Plan: Recommendations for the 1980s.*** Sacramento, September 1979.

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. ***Study of Fee Impact:*** *Progress Report.* Sacramento, December 1986.

Community College Institutional Research Consortium. *Interdistrict Attendance at Selected Community Colleges in Southern California* (draft). Los Angeles, May 1985.

Institutional Research Committee, MiraCosta Community College District. *An Analysis of MiraCosta District Students Attending Palomar College. Spring 1984.* Oceanside, September 1984.

Los Angeles Community College District. *A Preliminary Review of Student Migration Patterns in the Los Angeles Area.* Los Angeles, September 1984.

_____. *Interdistrict Flow Comparisons of Enrollment and ADA, Los Angeles Community College and Adjacent College Districts, Spring 1984 through Fall 1985.* Los Angeles, July 1986.

Peralta Community College District. *Peralta Facts: Students From Other Districts.* Oakland, April 1985.

APPENDIX A

INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT SURVEY

Methodology

A telephone survey of community college administrators (chief executive officers, business officials, and admissions and records personnel) was conducted by the Research and Analysis Unit of the Chancellor's Office during October and November of 1986. A sample of 21 districts was selected, based on their having the most "active" interdistrict enrollment patterns. Activity was measured by the net percentage student inflow or outflow was of total district enrollment in the fall of 1985. All survey districts had a net inflow or net outflow in excess of 10% of their enrollment, with the exceptions of Compton, Contra Costa, Palomar, Peralta, and Rio Hondo. The districts contacted were:

Cerritos
Chaffey
Citrus
Coast
Compton
Contra Costa
El Camino
Glendale
Grossmont
Los Angeles
MiraCosta
Mt. San Jacinto
Palomar
Peralta
Rio Hondo
Saddleback
Santa Monica
San Jose
South County
Sierra
West Valley

For purposes of this report, it was assumed that the other 49 districts are not currently affected to any significant degree by interdistrict enrollments.

Questions and Results

1. Is student migration among community college districts a problem of concern for your district? YES 3 NO 18 If yes, please describe the characteristics of the problem.

   Of the 21 districts surveyed, three indicated that student migration was a problem: Peralta, MiraCosta, and Los Angeles. MiraCosta and Los Angeles had a net outflow of students in the fall of 1985. Fall 1984 data provided by Peralta indicates the district had a net inflow of 146 students.

The problem is characterized by these three districts as a drain on enrollment and revenues from small or urban colleges which are surrounded by affluent districts with larger, well-established colleges. Better locations, programs, and student facilities tend to draw the more affluent, predominantly White, full-time students to these other districts. This loss of enrollment, therefore, inhibits the ability of the sending district to offer and maintain comprehensive programs and services.

Of the other 18 districts surveyed, two had a significant net outflow as a percent of total enrollment: San Jose and Saddleback. The loss of students from these districts are mainly a function of district boundaries, location of colleges or center, and commuting patterns.

Most of the districts surveyed indicated that interdistrict attendance has not been a problem since passage of Proposition 13 (1978) and the revision of the funding mechanism. In some instances, interdistrict enrollment enables the district to maintain a more diverse program mix.

2. Do you currently have interdistrict attendance agreements with surrounding districts? YES 5 NO 16 If yes, please list the districts and briefly summarize the agreements.

Most districts indicated they no longer have interdistrict attendance agreements. If interdistrict attendance is addressed at all, it is through informal unwritten agreements for free flow. All districts that stated that they have agreements are within Los Angeles County and predominantly with the Los Angeles Community College District.

With the exception of the Los Angeles/Santa Monica agreement, the typical agreement allows free flow for students taking six units or less or students enrolled in a program which is not offered at the sending college. Students enrolled in more than six units or in a program offered at the resident college are required to obtain a permit to attend the other district.

The current three and one-half year (1/1/86 to 6/30/89) agreement between Los Angeles and Santa Monica provides a blanket permit for enrollment of students up to a net of 5,000 ADA, excluding special session and noncredit ADA. For ADA in excess of 5,000 net, Santa Monica must remit to Los Angeles an amount per ADA which increases as the level of ADA beyond 5,000 increases. In succeeding years of the agreement, the higher rates of reimbursement are paid for lower levels of ADA generated beyond 5,000 ADA.

3. Has the number of interdistrict attendance agreements changed over the prior two years?

INCREASED 0 DECREASED 0 REMAINED CONSTANT 21

4. Are you addressing student migration by some means other than interdistrict attendance agreements and notices of restriction? YES 4 NO 17 If yes, please describe your efforts.

Most districts actively recruit high school students through advertising campaigns on radio, television, and in newspapers, as well as information tables and opportunity workshops at high schools. Districts are also attempting to improve student services and facilities in order to compete with larger, established colleges and UC and CSU campuses.

5. Are program and course offerings in your district affected by student migration? FAVORABLY 3 ADVERSELY 2 NOT AT ALL 16 Specifically, what impact has interdistrict attendance had on the transfer and vocational programs at your district? Please explain.

Two districts (Peralta and Los Angeles) reported they are adversely affected in transfer and vocational programs due to student migration. Three districts (Santa Monica, Glendale, and Sierra), all of which are are large importers of students, report a favorable impact, while the majority of districts indicate student migration has no impact on programs and services.

6. Has student migration had an effect on your district's fiscal stability and financial planning capability? YES 6 NO 15 Please explain.

The obvious losses of ADA and revenue due to student migration were indicated as problems by all districts answering yes to the question. One district also indicated a considerable drain on student financial aid budgets due to a large inflow of students from other districts. District financial planning capability is affected by sudden unilateral actions of another district (e.g., notices of restriction and establishment of new centers).

7. Could facilities be better utilized and/or duplicative programs be eliminated by coordinated and structured interdistrict attendance with adjacent districts? YES 3 NO 18 If yes, please explain.

Some adjacent districts are attempting to coordinate program activity. However, most districts establish comprehensive programs and services at each college regardless of offerings at other districts.

8. Why do you feel students choose to attend community colleges outside of their district of residence?

The following list is prioritized based on the number of times the response was given. (Fourteen of the 21 districts responded to this question.)

		# of Responses
1.	Location of the college or center in relationship to the home and workplace	8
2.	Diversity of program offerings.	7
3.	Reputation or image of the college.	5
4.	Quality of programs.	3
5.	Larger more established college.	2
6.	More class sections.	1
7.	Academic calendar.	1
8.	Security (less crime on campus and in the district).	1
9.	Good ethnic balance.	1
10.	Parents attended college.	1
11.	Friends attend the college and/or better student facilities.	1
12.	Younger student enrollment.	1
13.	More financial aid.	1

The Education Code requires colleges to publish a notice of restriction in the college catalog. A review of catalogs for the 21 districts in this survey indicates:

		Number of Districts
1.	No restrictions.	7
2.	Some restrictions on district residents and the possibility of restrictions by other districts.	3
3.	The possibility of restrictions by other districts.	11
		21

Table 1 shows enrollment changes for the 21 survey districts between fall 1982 and fall 1985.

Table I
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SURVEY DISTRICTS
CREDIT ENROLLMENT
FALL 1982 AND FALL 1985

DISTRICT	FALL 1982	FALL 1985	PERCENT CHANGE
Cerritos	22,909	17,612	-22.8
Chaffey	12,680	9,629	-24.1
Citrus	10,052	9,083	-9.6
Coast	61,401	49,452	-19.5
Compton	4,564	3,718	-18.5
Contra Costa	33,975	28,696	-15.5
El Camino	29,504	24,703	-16.3
Glendale	11,535	10,723	-7.0
Grossmont	18,193	16,918	-7.0
Los Angeles	134,729	93,026	-31.0
MiraCosta	6,194	5,507	-11.1
Mt. San Jacinto	3,678	3,122	-15.1
Palomar	17,169	13,616	-20.7
Peralta	31,384	25,400	-19.1
Rio Hondo	11,850	11,807	-0.4
Saddleback	23,696	23,131	-2.4
Santa Monica	20,018	19,629	-1.9.5
South County	21,728	19,373	-10.8
Sierra	9,838	9,468	-3.8
West Valley	25,386	21,719	-16.2
TOTAL	510,383	416,331	-18.4
STATE TOTAL	1,209,987	1,004,311	-17.0

Source: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Management Information Services, 1986.

APPENDIX B
INTERDISTRICT STUDENT ENROLLMENT
ALL DISTRICTS
FALL 1985

Table I
FALL 1985 INTERDISTRICT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

District	Outflow	Inflow	Enrollment 1985	Netout	Net in
Santa Monica	253	13,767	23,064		58.59
San Jose	7,812	27	16,627	46.82	
West Valley	198	9,570	21,719		43.15
Los Angeles	33,538	6,202	93,026	29.30	
Mira Costa	3,625	1,816	7,816	23.15	
Cerritos	846	5,004	18,351		22.66
Saddleback	6,659	1,432	23,131	22.60	
Coast	2,918	13,674	51,724		20.80
Glendale	1,034	4,541	17,322		20.25
El Camino	2,127	7,122	24,865		20.09
Grossmont	1,880	5,127	16,919		19.19
Sierra	266	2,106	9,615		19.13
Citrus	1,563	3,293	9,083		19.04
Pasadena	1,813	5,628	22,637		16.85
South County	1,563	4,030	19,373		12.73
Mt. San Jacinto	418	28	3,136	12.44	
Chaffey	3,107	1,824	10,977	11.68	
Long Beach	2,792	461	23,793	9.79	
Rio Hondo	2,393	3,182	11,807		6.68
Rancho Santiago	5,417	7,244	30,352		6.02
Riverside	1,210	410	13,408	5.96	
Napa	405	803	7,152		5.57
Los Rios	2,131	105	37,764	5.36	
Mendicino Lake	228	87	3,183	4.43	
Fremont-Newark	1,874	1,551	7,499	4.31	
Hartnell	423	684	6,522		4.00
Compton	923	775	3,718	3.99	
West Hills	357	273	2,138	3.93	
San Mateo	1,584	2,737	29,503		3.91
Sonoma	573	1,378	21,587		3.73
Antelope Valley	221	442	6,927		3.19
Solano	774	528	8,840	2.79	
Yuba	289	499	8,141		2.58
San Bernardino	832	1,123	13,465		2.16
Merced	121	281	7,528		2.12

Table 1 (Continued)

District	Outflow	Inflow	Enrollment 1985	Net out	Net in
Yosemite	263	536	12,957		2.11
Peralta	2,209	2,718	27,656		1.84
Butte	150	277	7,084		1.79
Marin	979	733	14,364	1.72	
Barstow	32	2	1,776	1.69	
Cabrillo	475	328	10,055	1.46	
Siskiyou	41	6	2,665	1.31	
San Francisco	2,445	1,814	55,952	1.13	
San Luis Obispo	109	52	6,097	0.94	
Santa Barbara	98	288	20,593		0.92
Southwestern	2,025	1,934	10,072	0.91	
Shasta	132	65	8,165	0.82	
West Kern	31	38	978		0.72
Mt. San Antonio	4,547	4,355	27,161	0.71	
State Center	357	239	16,721	0.71	
Sequoias	593	642	7,810		0.63
Ventura	1,095	939	26,735	0.59	
Lake Tahoe	40	32	1,495	0.54	
Monterey Peninsula	430	468	7,683		0.49
Coachella Valley	106	133	5,920		0.46
San Diego	6,110	5,955	61,476	0.25	
Palomar	3,302	3,323	15,445		0.14
Santa Clarita	619	614	3,630	0.14	
Kern	431	441	16,937		0.06
(Miscoded)	1,208				
Allan Hancock	254		11,639		
Contra Costa	2,545		28,734		
Foothill	2,374		40,758		
Gavilan	336		2,969		
Imperial	46		3,546		
Lassen	39		2,001		
North Orange	7,147		55,317		
Palo Verde	22		730		
Redwoods	75		8,012		
San Joaquin	656		14,745		
Victor Valley	198		4,958		

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services, 1986

Table 2
PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT FROM OTHER DISTRICTS

District	Inflow	Enrollment 1985	Percent
Santa Monica	13,767	23,064	59.69
West Valley	9,570	21,719	44.06
Citrus	3,293	9,083	36.25
Grossmont	5,127	16,919	30.30
El Camino	7,122	24,685	28.64
Cerritos	5,004	18,351	27.27
Rio Hondo	3,182	11,807	26.95
Coast	13,674	51,724	26.44
Glendale	4,541	17,322	26.22
Pasadena	5,628	22,637	24.86
Rancho Santiago	7,244	30,352	23.87
Mira Costa	1,816	7,816	23.23
Sierra	2,106	9,615	21.90
Palomar	3,323	15,445	21.52
Compton	775	3,718	20.84
South County	4,030	19,373	20.80
Fremont-Newark	1,551	7,499	20.68
Southwestern	1,934	10,072	19.20
Santa Clarita	614	3,630	16.91
Chaffey	1,824	10,977	16.62
Mt. San Antonio	4,355	27,161	16.03
West Hills	273	2,138	12.77
Napa	803	7,152	11.23
Hartnell	684	6,522	10.49
Peralta	2,718	27,656	9.83
San Diego	5,955	61,476	9.69
San Mateo	2,737	29,503	9.28
San Bernardino	1,123	13,465	8.34
Sequoias	642	7,810	8.22
Los Angeles	6,202	93,026	6.67
Sonoma	1,378	21,587	6.38
Antelope Valley	442	6,927	6.38
Saddleback	1,432	23,131	6.19
Yuba	499	8,141	6.13
Monterey Peninsula	468	7,683	6.09

Table 2 (Continued)

District	Inflow	Enrollment 1985	Percent
Solano	528	8,840	5.97
Marin	733	14,364	5.10
Yosemite	536	12,957	4.14
Butte	277	7,084	3.91
West Kern	38	978	3.89
Merced	281	7,528	3.73
Ventura	939	26,735	3.51
Cabrillo	328	10,055	3.26
San Francisco	1,814	55,952	3.24
Riverside	410	13,408	3.06
Mendocino Lake	87	3,183	2.73
Kern	441	16,937	2.60
Coachella Valley	133	5,920	2.25
Lake Tahoe	32	1,495	2.14
Long Beach	461	23,793	1.94
State Center	239	16,721	1.43
Santa Barbara	288	20,593	1.40
Mt. San Jacinto	28	3,136	0.89
San Luis Obispo	52	6,097	0.85
Shasta	65	8,165	0.80
Los Rios	105	37,764	0.28
Siskiyou	6	2,665	0.23
San Jose	27	16,627	0.16
Barstow	2	1,776	0.11
Allan Hancock		11,639	
Contra Costa		28,734	
Foothill		40,758	
Gavilan		2,969	
Imperial		3,546	
Lassen		2,001	
North Orange		55,317	
Palo Verde		730	
Redwoods		8,012	
San Joaquin		14,745	
Victor Valley		4,958	

SOURCE: See Table 1.

APPENDIX C

STATEWIDE COMPARISON OF INTERDISTRICT STUDENTS AND OTHER STUDENTS CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FALL 1985

Table 1
FULL-TIME, PART TIME AND NONCREDIT STUDENTS

	FULL TIME		PART TIME		NONCREDIT		TOTAL	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
Interdistrict Students	34,341	25 7	96,200	72 0	3,145	2 3	133,686	100 0
All Other Students	190,227	21 9	544,405	62 6	134,985	15 5	869,617	100 0

Table 2
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER AND ETHNICITY

	MALE	FEMALE	AM IND/ ALASKAN	ASIAN/ PAC ISL	BLACK	WHITE	HISP.	FILIP.	OTHER	NON-WHITE
Interdist. Students	48 5	51 5	1.3	9 0	9 4	61 9	13 7	2 9	1 7	38 1
All Other Students	43 4	56 6	1 3	10 2	7 5	61 9	14 2	2 3	2 5	38 1

Table 3
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY AGE

	17 OR UNDER	18	19	20 24	25-29	30 49	50 OR OVER
Interdistrict Students	1.7	9.0	10.2	29 9	16.6	26 6	5.9
All Other Students	2.0	7.4	7.9	25 2	16.0	29 9	11 6

Table 4
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY LEVEL OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

	HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT	FRESHMAN	SOPHOMORE	OTHER UNDER GRADUATE	AA/AS DEGREE	BA/BS OR HIGHER DEGREE
Interdistrict Students	1.3	64.2	13 5	6.7	6 3	7 9
All Other Students	1 8	62 1	14 7	7.7	5 7	8 1

Table 5
DISTRIBUTION BY ENROLLMENT STATUS

	FIRST TIME		FIRST-TIME TRANSFER		RETURN TRANSFER		RETURNING		CONTINUING	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO	%	NO	%
Interdistrict Students	31,762	23 9	20,152	15 2	7,050	5 3	12,230	9 2	61,480	46 3
All Other Students	165,225	21 3	78,746	10 2	28,511	3 7	110,496	14 2	392,579	50 6

Source for all tables: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Management Information Services, 1986.

APPENDIX D

REGIONAL COMPARISON OF INTERDISTRICT STUDENTS AND OTHER STUDENTS CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FALL 1985

Table I
FULL TIME, PART TIME, AND NONCREDIT STUDENTS

REGION AND CATEGORY	FULL TIME		PART-TIME		NONCREDIT		TOTAL	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
EAST BAY AREA								
Interdistrict	2,088	25.2	6,052	72.9	159	1.9	8,299	100.0
Other	9,974	21.6	34,158	73.9	2,097	4.5	46,299	100.0
SOUTH BAY AREA								
Interdistrict	2,892	25.9	8,256	74.1			11,148	100.0
Other	8,328	23.8	26,559	76.0	54	.2	34,941	100.0
LOS ANGELES								
Interdistrict	12,306	25.5	35,759	74.1	170	.4	48,235	100.0
Other	55,155	25.0	147,352	66.8	18,246	8.3	220,713	100.0
RIVERSIDE/ SAN BERNARDINO								
Interdistrict	1,054	30.0	2,075	59.9	389	11.1	3,518	100.0
Other	10,410	23.5	31,397	70.9	2,501	5.6	44,308	100.0
ORANGE								
Interdistrict	4,326	19.4	17,162	76.8	862	3.9	22,350	100.0
Other	12,929	15.6	56,990	68.8	12,938	15.6	82,857	100.0
SAN DIEGO								
Interdistrict	5,216	28.7	12,493	68.8	446	2.5	18,155	100.0
Other	17,664	18.9	46,401	49.6	29,508	31.5	93,573	100.0

Table 2
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER AND ETHNICITY

REGION AND CATEGORY	MALE	FEMALE	AM IND ALASKAN	ASIAN/ PAC ISL	BLACK	WHITE	HISP	FILIP	OTHER	NON WHITE
EAST BAY AREA										
Interdistrict	52.5	47.5	1.6	9.8	16.8	53 6	8.8	4.8	4.7	46.4
Other	43.1	56.9	1.3	12.1	17.8	51 3	7.9	3.6	5.9	48.7
SOUTH BAY AREA										
Interdistrict	48.7	57.3	1.2	16.7	4.7	59.2	10.5	5.9	1 7	40.8
Other	46.7	53.3	3.0	16.5	3.6	60.8	12.0	3 1	1 0	39.2
LOS ANGELES										
Interdistrict	46.9	53.1	1.1	10.8	15 2	49.6	19.3	2.5	1.4	50.4
Other	45.2	54.8	1.0	10.7	12 5	49 9	20.3	2.9	2.8	50.1
RIVERSIDE/ SAN BERNARDINO										
Interdistrict	46.0	54.0	2.0	2.8	9.0	69.9	13.7	.8	1.9	30.1
Other	42.0	58.0	1 7	3.4	7.3	69.6	14.7	.8	2 5	30.4
ORANGE										
Interdistrict	48.9	51.1	1 0	10.7	2.5	74 4	8 8	1 0	1 6	25.6
Other	43.6	56.4	1.1	9.8	1.3	70.9	14 1	7	2.1	29.1
SAN DIEGO										
Interdistrict	49.1	50.9	1 5	3 8	5 4	72 1	11 2	4.5	1.5	27.9
Other	43.1	56.9	1.5	8 4	6 5	63 7	14 7	3.2	1.9	36.3

Table 3
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY AGE

REGION AND CATEGORY	17 OR UNDER	18	19	20-24	25-29	30-49	50 OR OVER
EAST BAY AREA							
Interdistrict	1.2	8.6	10.3	29.3	16.1	28.4	6.2
Other	1.9	6.4	7.2	24.4	16.7	32.7	10.7
SOUTH BAY AREA							
Interdistrict	1.6	8.0	9.9	30.0	18.8	27.7	4.0
Other	1.5	6.6	8.6	29.5	18.1	29.2	6.5
LOS ANGELES							
Interdistrict	2.0	9.8	11.6	31.5	16.0	24.2	4.9
Other	1.9	7.9	8.8	29.2	17.0	26.9	8.2
RIVERSIDE/ SAN BERNARDINO							
Interdistrict	1.8	8.0	8.1	26.6	17.4	32.8	5.3
Other	2.4	8.4	8.5	24.8	16.9	32.4	6.6
ORANGE							
Interdistrict	1.1	6.1	7.5	28.9	18.8	28.9	8.6
Other	1.5	6.7	7.3	24.9	15.1	27.2	17.4
SAN DIEGO							
Interdistrict	1.5	8.5	9.7	33.0	16.6	24.7	5.9
Other	2.8	7.1	6.8	24.0	15.8	27.9	15.6

Table 4
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY LEVEL OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

REGION AND CATEGORY	HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT	FRESHMAN	SOPHOMORE	OTHER UNDER GRADUATE	AA/AS DEGREE	BA/BSOR HIGHER DEGREE
EAST BAY AREA						
Interdistrict	.3	61.2	14.8	6.9	5.5	11.3
Other	1.1	56.5	17.0	7.0	5.6	12.8
SOUTH BAY AREA						
Interdistrict	2.3	59.1	15.0	6.8	6.3	10.4
Other	1.2	66.8	17.9	3.9	3.9	6.3
LOS ANGELES						
Interdistrict	1.0	66.3	12.7	6.1	4.5	9.5
Other	1.4	61.5	15.6	9.1	4.6	7.8
RIVERSIDE/ SAN BERNARDINO						
Interdistrict	1.1	63.5	15.8	6.8	7.4	5.4
Other	2.8	66.2	13.2	5.4	8.0	6.5
ORANGE						
Interdistrict	1.4	57.2	15.2	8.5	12.8	4.8
Other	1.6	58.9	13.1	7.7	12.0	6.7
SAN DIEGO						
Interdistrict	2.5	63.8	14.4	7.9	4.9	6.5
Other	4.5	60.0	14.4	8.6	4.8	7.7

Table 5
ENROLLMENT STATUS

REGION AND CATEGORY	FIRST TIME		FIRST TIME TRANSFER		RETURN TRANSFER		RETURNING		CONTINUING	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
EAST BAY AREA										
Interdistrict	1,694	20.4	1,665	20.1	120	1.4	774	9.3	4,046	48.8
Other	9,049	19.6	5,468	11.8	608	1.3	7,772	16.8	23,325	50.5
SOUTH BAY AREA										
Interdistrict	4,131	37.1	322	2.9	239	2.1	1,734	15.6	4,722	42.4
Other	8,916	25.6	1,427	4.1	3,017	8.7	5,719	16.4	15,704	45.1
LOS ANGELES										
Interdistrict	10,381	21.7	5,629	11.7	3,813	8.0	4,014	8.4	24,090	50.3
Other	37,963	18.6	20,404	10.0	7,134	3.5	20,377	10.0	118,548	58.0
RIVERSIDE/ SAN BERNARDINO										
Interdistrict	847	25.0	761	22.5	773	2.2	774	22.9	927	27.4
Other	10,249	23.9	5,837	13.6	1,058	2.5	11,990	28.0	13,693	32.0
ORANGE										
Interdistrict	5,041	22.6	3,526	15.8	1,357	6.1	1,664	7.4	10,762	48.2
Other	16,766	20.2	7,810	9.4	4,833	5.8	9,726	11.7	43,703	52.8
SAN DIEGO										
Interdistrict	3,388	18.8	4,231	23.5	839	4.7	1,129	6.3	8,434	46.8
Other	14,242	21.3	9,385	14.1	3,601	5.4	5,792	8.7	33,738	50.5

Source for all tables in Appendix D: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services, 1986.

NOTE: The six regions examined in Appendix D consist of the following districts:

EAST BAY AREA

Fremont-Newark
Peralta
South County

SOUTH BAY AREA

Fremont-Newark
San Jose
West Valley

LOS ANGELES

Cerritos
Compton
El Camino
Glendale
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Pasadena
Rio Hondo
Santa Clarita
Santa Monica
Ventura

RIVERSIDE/SAN BERNARDINO

Chaffey
Coachella Valley
Mt. San Jacinto
Riverside
San Bernardino

ORANGE

Coast
Rancho Santiago
Saddleback

SAN DIEGO

Grossmont
MiraCosta
Palomar
San Diego
Southwestern

This analysis is limited in some cases because not all districts report students as residents of other community college districts.

APPENDIX E

NUMBER AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERDISTRICT ENROLLMENT, SELECTED DISTRICTS, FALL 1985

Table 1
Percent Distribution of Students, Fall 1985

DISTRICT	CATEGORY	INCOMING MIGRANTS	OWN RESIDENTS	LOS ANGELES RESIDENTS
Glendale	Male	44%	35%	46%
	Asian	10	13	12
	Black	4	1	18
	Hispanic	23	26	25
	White	55	54	39
	Nonwhite	45	46	61
Pasadena	Male	45	48	46
	Asian	22	14	12
	Black	4	12	18
	Hispanic	28	13	25
	White	41	56	39
	Nonwhite	59	44	61
El Camino	Male	46	46	46
	Asian	15	12	12
	Black	36	12	18
	Hispanic	12	13	25
	White	33	60	39
	Nonwhite	67	41	61
Santa Monica	Male	46	37	46
	Asian	10	15	12
	Black	13	6	18
	Hispanic	11	9	25
	White	63	69	39
	Nonwhite	37	31	61
Rio Hondo	Male	56	59	46
	Asian	10	7	12
	Black	3	1	18
	Hispanic	49	49	25
	White	34	37	39
	Nonwhite	66	63	61
Cerritos	Male	45	48	46
	Asian	6	14	12
	Black	10	6	18
	Hispanic	32	22	25
	White	46	49	39
	Nonwhite	54	52	61

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information Services, 1986.

Table 2
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, FALL 1985

DISTRICT	CATEGORY	MIGRANTS TO SOUTH COUNTY	SOUTH COUNTY RESIDENT ENROLLMENT	PERALTA RESIDENT ENROLLMENT
South County	Male	54%	48%	40%
	Asian	9	6	15
	Black	18	5	31
	Hispanic	9	10	6
	White	55	67	36
	Nonwhite	45	33	64

DISTRICT	CATEGORY	MIGRANTS TO PERALTA	PERALTA RESIDENT ENROLLMENT	CONTRA COSTA RESIDENT ENROLLMENT	SOUTH COUNTY RESIDENT ENROLLMENT
Peralta	Male	56%	40%	45%	43%
	Asian	11	15	4	6
	Black	22	31	13	9
	Hispanic	7	6	6	7
	White	44	36	62	75
	Nonwhite	56	64	38	25

Source: See Table 1.

Table 3
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, FALL 1985

DISTRICT	CATEGORY	MIGRANTS TO WEST VALLEY	WEST VALLEY RESIDENT	SAN JOSE RESIDENTS
West Valley	Male	49%	44%	50%
	Asian	18	14	22
	Black	5	2	6
	Hispanic	10	7	18
	White	58	73	45
	Nonwhite	42	27	55

DISTRICT	CATEGORY	MIGRANTS TO COAST	COAST RESIDENTS	RANCHO SANTIAGO RESIDENTS	SADDLEBACK RESIDENTS
Coast	Male	48%	43%	51%	37%
	Asian	10	10	14	5
	Black	2	1	3	1
	Hispanic	8	5	37	4
	White	76	81	43	86
	Nonwhite	24	19	57	4

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges MAR 27 1987